

REMARKS

Claims 37-44, 46-50, and 52-60 were pending and rejected. In response, Applicant have amended claims 37, 38, 47, 52, 56-57 and 60 as set forth above, and cancelled claim 59. No new matter has been introduced. Claims 37-44, 46-50, 52-58, and 60 are now pending.

Amendments

Claim 37 has been amended in substance with the “input port” element previously recited in claim 38, along with conforming language.

Claim 38 has been amended to remove the “input port” element moved to claim 37, and conform the claim as a method claim.

Claim 47 has been similar amended as claim 37.

Claim 52 has been amended to conform claim 52 to the amendments entered for claim 47.

Claim 56 has been amended to correct a previously undetected informality.

Claims 57 and 60 have been similarly amended as Claims 37 and 47.

Accordingly, the subject matter of all amendments either have been previously presented, or are merely conforming in nature; therefore no new matter has been introduced, and no new search is required. For reasons set forth below, the amended claims are patentable over the cited references.

Claims Objections

Claims 57 and 60 were objected to. The objections have been addressed by the above amendments. Thus, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

35 USC §102(b) Rejections

In the subject Office Action, claims 59-60 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Requa. In response, Applicants have cancelled claim 59, without prejudice. With respect to claim 60, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. Claim 60 recites in pertinent part, “the second store being a part of a frame of buffers spanning the plurality of interconnected preselected computation nodes to store a subgroup of instructions loaded into the frame of buffers prior to the subgroup of instructions having all necessary associated operands for execution ...”

In the Final Office Action, when rejecting the other claims, the Examiner admitted that Requa does not teach the subject matter of this recited feature (and instead cites Patterson to remedy this deficiency). And because Requa fails to teach at least one recited feature, claim 60 is therefore patentable over Requa under 35 USC §102(b).

Nonetheless, Applicants have amended Claim 60 to further recite:

“an input port capable of directly coupling the computing resource to at least a first other preselected computation node included in the plurality of interconnected preselected computation nodes, ...
an output port coupled to the execution unit and capable of directly coupling the computing resource to at least a second other preselected computation node ...,
and
a router coupled to the execution unit, and configured to direct an output data of the execution unit to the output port for direct provision to the at least one preselected second other computation node.”

Without addressing whether Patterson remedies Requa’s deficiencies, Patterson’s alleged distributed function units (cited by the Examiner as reading on the recited “computation nodes”) are coupled to the memory, and are NOT coupled to each other (see e.g. the Figure in the cited pages of Patterson). And there is no teaching in Patterson to suggest further modification to achieve the immediately above quoted recitations of claim 60. Accordingly, the combination of Requa and Patterson fails to teach or suggest at least one feature of claim 60. Therefore, amended claim 60 is patentable over Requa and Patterson, individually or in combination.

35 USC §103(a) Rejections

In the subject Office Action, claims 37-44, 46-50, and 52-58 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as not patentable in view of Requa and Patterson.

As noted earlier, in the subject Office Action, the Examiner has admitted that Requa does not teach “loading a subset of instructions of the assigned group of instructions into a frame of buffers comprising stores disposed on the subset of interconnected preselected computation nodes

having been assigned the group of instructions, prior to the associated operands of the subset of instructions are available...” The Action cites Patterson to remedy the deficiency.

In response, notwithstanding Applicants’ disagreement with the Examiner’s reasoning, in the interest of furthering prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 37 to recite the “input port” feature previously recited in claim 38, along with conforming language. Specifically, applicants have amended claim 37 to recite “receiving associated operands of the subset of instructions by the preselected computation nodes, including a first of the preselected computation nodes directly receiving a first associated operand of a first instruction loaded into the first preselected computation node, from a second of the preselected computation nodes, wherein the first computation node has an input port capable of being coupled to the second computation node to enable the directly receiving of the first associated operand ...”

As discussed earlier, without addressing whether Patterson remedies Requa’s deficiencies, Patterson’s alleged distributed function units are coupled to the memory, and are NOT coupled to each other. And there is no teaching in Patterson to suggest further modification to achieve the above-quoted recitations (in the discussion of claim 60 being patentable over the combined references). Accordingly, the combination of Requa and Patterson still fails to teach or suggest at least one feature of amended claim 37. Therefore, amended claim 37 is patentable over Requa and Patterson, individually or in combination.

Claims 47 and 57 have been similarly amended as claims 37 and 60. Thus, for at least similar reasons, claims 47 and 57 are patentable over the cited references.

Claims 38-44, 46, 48-50, 52-56, and 58 depend from either claim 37, 47 and 57, incorporating their recitations. Therefore, for at least similar reasons, claims 38-44, 46, 48-50, 52-56, and 58 are patentable over the cited references. Claims 38-44, 46, 48-50, 52-56, and 58 are further patentable over the cited references by virtue of their additional recitations.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that, all remaining pending claims are now in condition of allowance. Therefore, early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested. Should there be any question with Applicants’ response, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the undersigned at 206-381-8819 (Direct).

Lastly, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge shortages or credit overpayments to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson & Wyatt, P.C.

Dated: January 4, 2009

/Al AuYeung/
Al AuYeung
Reg. No. 35,432